JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Stephen Hoare			DEFENDANTS Chata Biosystems, LLC					
(b) County of Residence o	f First Listed Plaintiff F	Bucks	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
, ,	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA							
` John Ś. Harrison,	Address, and Telephone Numbe Esquire; Broughal & Deet, Bethlehem, PA 18	DeVito, L.L.P.	Attorneys (If Known) Asima J. Ahmad, Esquire; Jackson Lewis Three Parkway, 1601 Cherry St., Suite 1350 Philadelphia, PA 19102-1317					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)		RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff			
☐ I U.S. Government Plaintiff ### 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)				FF DEF 1				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2				
·			Citizen or Subject of a G	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6			
IV. NATURE OF SUIT								
CONTRACT		RTS	TORFETTURE/PENALTY	1	OTHER STATUTES			
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations			
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product		1	☐ 480 Consumer Credit			
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY	LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY B61 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/			
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	□ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation	□ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))	Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration			
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	☐ 791 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure			
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☑ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Habcas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes			
□ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education		□ 462 Naturalization Application □ 465 Other Immigration Actions	·				
	moved from 🔲 3	Remanded from	Reinstated or	r District Litigation	ict			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN Brief description of ca	§ 621 et seq	ling (Do not cite jurisdictional stat	utes uniess diversity).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		ge Discrimination and IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	Employment Act DEMAND \$ In excess_Qf \$1		if demanded in complaint:			
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE A)	DOCKET NUMBER				
DATE 04/20/2016		SIGNATURE F AT YOR	NEY OF RECORD	Johr	S. Harrison			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY								
RECEIPT# AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUE	OGE			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: 129 Frog Hollow Road, Churchville, I	PA 18966				
Address of Defendant: 5858 Wright Drive, Loveland, CO 805	38				
190 Eman II-11 D1 G1	urchville. PA 18966	_			
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 129 FTOG HOLLOW ROAD, Unit (Use Reverse Side For Accident, Incident or Transaction)					
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation an	ad any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?				
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))		n			
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No ⊠				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	ar previously terminated action in this court?				
	Yes□ No K				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su action in this court?	if pending or within one year previously terminated				
	Yes□ No K I				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier nu					
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ Not. A.				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	cose filed by the same individual?				
4. Is this case a second of successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro-section rights	Yes□ No 🔯				
	165— 140—				
CIVIL: (Place 🗸 in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)					
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. □ Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury				
5. □ Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)				
7. dX Civil Rights	7. Products Liability				
8. Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases				
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)				
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases	(k loade speedily)	_			
(Please specify)					
ARBITRATION CERTI					
John S. Harrison, Esquire (Check Appropriate Cat					
X Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be	elief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of				
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;					
X Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					
DATE: 4/21/2016	53864				
/ Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	e has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or w	rithin one year previously terminated action in this court				
except as noted above.					
DATE: 4/21/2016	53864				
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				

CIV, 609 (5/2012)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

STEPHI	EN HUAKE,		:		CIVIL ACTION			
		v.	:					
СНАТА	BIOSYSTEMS, LLC		:		NO.			
	In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.							
	SELECT ONE OF	THE FOLLOWING	G CASE MANA	GEMENT TR	ACKS:			
	(a) Habeas Corpus	 Cases brought unde 	r 28 U.S.C. § 2	241 through § 2	255.	()	
		 Cases requesting revices denying plaintif 			tary of Health	()	
	(c) Arbitration – Ca	ases required to be des	signated for arb	itration under L	ocal Civil Rule 53.2.	()	
	(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.							
	commonly refer	ement – Cases that do red to as complex and reverse side of this for ses.)	d that need spec	ial or intense m	anagement by	()	
	(f) Standard Manag	gement – Cases that d	not fall into a	ny one of the ot	her tracks.	(X)	
	4/21/2016		カノ	— /	Plaintiff		_	
	Date	Attorne	ey-at-law	At	torney for		-	
	(610) 865-366	610) 8	3 5 5-0969	johnl	narrison@broughal	-de	<u>vi</u> to.com	
	Telephone	FAX N	lumber	E-	Mail Address			

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

STEPHEN HOARE, :

Plaintiff : CIVIL ACTION NO.:

:

CHATA BIOSYSTEMS, LLC,

v.

:

Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT AND JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff, Stephen Hoare, by his attorneys, Broughal & DeVito, L.L.P., brings this Complaint against Defendant Chata Biosystems, LLC.

NATURE OF ACTION

1. This is an age discrimination claim alleging a violation of the Age Discrimination and Employment Act ("ADEA") and Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Honorable Court has original jurisdiction over the case under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as it raises federal ADEA claims under the laws of the United States.
- 3. This Honorable Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 4. This Honorable Court is the proper venue for this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2) because it is a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events giving rise to this cause of action arose.

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare ("Hoare") is an adult individual who lives at 129 Frog Hollow Road, Churchville, Bucks County, Pennsylvania 18966.
- 6. Defendant Chata Biosystems, LLC ("Defendant Chata") is a Colorado limited liability company with an address of 5858 Wright Drive, Loveland, Colorado 80538.

FACTS

- 7. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare was born on June 27, 1958, and is over 40 years old.
- 8. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare was hired by Defendant Chata in September 2009 in a sales position.
- 9. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare worked for Defendant Chata from a home office at his residence.
- 10. During the time he worked as a sales employee for Defendant Chata, Plaintiff Stephen Hoare performed his job excellently.
- 11. While Plaintiff Stephen Hoare was employed, Defendant Chata's owners and managers made age-based statements including "the ideal gal [for an open sales position] should be a young Asian gal that can sell to these labs;" and in reference to another employee, he "was ready for retirement."
 - 12. On November 6, 2014, Defendant Chata fired Plaintiff Stephen Hoare.
- 13. Defendant Chata transferred Plaintiff Stephen Hoare's job duties to someone named Ashley Wilhelm, who is approximately 30 years old and significantly younger than Plaintiff Stephen Hoare.

- 14. Other similarly placed sales employees who were significantly younger employees were treated better than Plaintiff Stephen Hoare and retained when Defendant Chata fired Plaintiff Stephen Hoare.
- 15. Defendant Chata's alleged reasons for termination were false given that significantly younger employees were given his job duties.

COUNT I ADEA

- 16. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 15 of this Complaint as if set those paragraphs are fully set forth here.
 - 17. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare is in a protected class.
- 18. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare was qualified to perform his job and had in fact been performing his job better than satisfactorily when he was fired.
- 19. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare was subjected to an adverse employment action when he was fired.
 - 20. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare was replaced by someone significantly younger.
- 21. At the time of his termination, other similarly situated, significantly younger employees were treated more favorably than Plaintiff Stephen Hoare.
- 22. Defendant Chata's termination of Plaintiff Stephen Hoare was a willful and intentional violation of the ADEA as can be seen in the pretextual reasons offered for his termination.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Stephen Hoare requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in his favor and award him damages as follows:

- Back pay;
- Front pay;
- Liquidated damages;
- Compensatory damages from the embarrassment and humiliation caused by Defendant Chata's conduct;
- Attorney fees; and
- Any other relief that the Court deems proper.

COUNT II PHRA

- 23. Plaintiff Stephen Hoare incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 22 of this Complaint as if those paragraphs are fully set forth here.
 - 24. The facts outlined above constitute a violation of the PHRA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Stephen Hoare requests judgment in his favor and remedies as follows:

- Reinstatement;
- Back pay;
- Front pay;
- Compensatory damages;
- Attorney fees; and

• Any other relief that the Court deems proper.

PLAINTIFF'S DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Stephen Hoare, through his attorneys, Broughal & DeVito, L.L.P., demands a trial by jury.

BROUGHAL & DeVITO, L.P.

Date: 4/2/12/0/6

By:

John S. Harrison, Esquire

Attorney I.D. #53864 38 W. Market Street Bethlehem, PA 18018

Telephone No.: (610) 865-3664 Facsimile No.: (610) 865-0969

Attorneys for Plaintiff